DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 968 HE 014 542

AUTHOR Konkel, Richard H.; Patterson, Lewis D.
TITLE Sharing Collegiate Resources: The New Challenge: Guidelines to Facilitate Interinstitutional Resource Sharing Based on a National Invitational Conference at Wingspread (Racine, Wisconsin, March 23-25, 1981).
INSTITUTION Council for Interinstitutional Leadership, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 26p.; Conference sponsored by the Council for Interinstitutional Leadership, the Education Commission of the States, and the State Higher Education Executive Officers.
AVAILABLE FROM Council for Interinstitutional Leadership, One Dupont Circle, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20036 (free).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Planning; Consortia; *Cooperative Programs; Dual Enrollment; *Educational Resources; Exchange Programs; Guidelines; *Higher Education; Human Resources; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Leadership; Mergers; *Shared Facilities; Shared Services; Statewide Planning; Student Exchange Programs; Teacher Exchange Programs

ABSTRACT

Guidelines that are designed to facilitate interinstitutional resource sharing are presented for trustees, legislators, business and lay leaders and educators based on a 1981 national conference. Attention is directed to the range of potential benefits of resource sharing, the structures and processes for achieving resource sharing, and the action steps that are needed to initiate resource sharing. Some of the general goals that can be realized through the pooling of institutional resources include: planned diversity of programs, new educational opportunities, improved quality of programs, costs avoidance and effectiveness, coordinated public relations, access to other regional resources and support, and greater institutional stability. Joint endeavors may include cooperative course offerings, student and faculty exchange, joint staff and faculty development, shared facilities, mergers, regional telecommunications, statewide group purchasing, interstate analyses and planning, and nationwide student recruitment and admissions. Three general ways to encourage resource sharing are: to recognize and support the cooperative leadership of institutional staff; to provide financial incentives; and to apply political and public persuasion. Alternative structures for resource sharing include: special purpose cooperative arrangement, long-range consortia, community and regional groupings of institutions, statewide associations and systems, interstate contracts and compacts, national networks and linkages, international agreements, and various combinations of structures. A list of conference participants and a brochure, "Policy Advice on Resource Sharing in Higher Education," are appended. (SW)

ED210968

Sharing Collegiate Resources: The New Challenge

Guidelines to Facilitate Interinstitutional Resource Sharing Based on a National Invitational Conference at Wingspread

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lewis D. Patterson

Council for Interinstitutional Leadership

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Richard H. Konkel*
Lewis D. Patterson**

October 1981

This publication was made possible through funds granted by the Ford Foundation. The content is solely the responsibility of the Council for Interinstitutional Leadership.

© 1981, Council for Interinstitutional Leadership

*Konkel, former Executive Director of the Southeast Florida Educational Consortium, is Dean of Academic Affairs, Dakota State College. As Chairperson of the CIL Task Force on State Relations, and as a member of the CIL Board, he had primary responsibility for planning the Wingspread Conference.

**Patterson is Executive Director of the Council for Interinstitutional Leadership.

HE 014 542

Purpose of The Conference

"A profound shift from the survival ethic to the cooperative ethic among higher education decision makers and providers is needed. The wholesale closing of smaller colleges may not be a viable solution. More massive state and federal funding is not on the horizon. The cooperative ethic has to be translated into system and institutional policy, organizational structures and processes, business practices, and funding patterns. The Wingspread Conference sought to identify and describe organizational structures and arrangements that offer promise for improving coordination and cooperation within state systems and between institutions. The conference also considered what changes are needed in policy, legislation and leadership to bring about an expansion of cooperative activities and sharing of resources by higher education institutions."

Richard H. Konkel, Chairperson
Conference Planning Committee*

Purpose of This Booklet

This monograph was prepared to offer basic guidelines to trustees, legislators, business and lay leaders, and educators for facilitating interinstitutional resource sharing.

A related brochure, "Policy Advice on Resource Sharing in Higher Education," also has been prepared to provide similar information in a shorter form.

No attempt was made to present the proceedings of the three-day conference or to summarize the papers of 19 program presenters because a document of that magnitude would require a book-length publication. Rather, the intent here is to identify and critique:

- the range of potential benefits of resource sharing,
- the structures and processes for achieving resource sharing, and
- the action steps that are needed to initiate resource sharing.

*The Conference Planning Committee, chaired by Konkel, included: John Folger, Sheldon H. Knorr, Richard M. Millard, and Lewis D. Patterson

Table of Contents

Conference Sponsors ..... Inside Front Cover

Purpose of the Conference 2

Purpose of This Booklet 2

Conference Presenters 4

Quotations and Paraphrases 5

Section I. Benefits and Potential of Resource Sharing

A. What Resources Can Institutions Share? 7
B. Why Share Resources? 7
C. Examples of Documented Benefits 8
D. Factors That Discourage and Encourage Cooperation and Sharing 9

Section II. Structures and Policies to Achieve Resource Sharing

A. The Impending Challenge 12
B. What Are the Alternative Structures for Resource Sharing? 12
C. What Kinds of Policies Are Needed to Further Encourage Resource Sharing? 13

Section III. Action Agendas to Achieve Cooperation and Sharing

A. Need for Leadership Commitment 16
B. Administrative Principles 17
C. Guidelines for Statutes, Policies, Regulations, Directives 18
D. Action Agendas 21

Bibliography/Footnote References 22

Appendix: Conference Participants 23

About CIL ..... Inside Back Cover

Conference Presenters

Keynoting the conference was E. Alden Dunham, Program Officer, Carnegie Corporation of New York. Chairperson of the conference was Franklin Patterson, Director, Center for Studies in Policy and the Public Interest, University of Massachusetts, Boston. Program presenters included:

- Robert Berdahl, Professor of Higher Education, University of Maryland
- Donald A. Johnson, Director, Quad-Cities Graduate Study Center, Rock Island, Illinois
- S. V. Martorana, Professor of Higher Education, Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University
- Richard W. Jonsen, Deputy Director, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
- Dean E. Tollefson, Executive Director, Union of Independent Colleges of Art
- Robert M. O'Neil, President, University of Wisconsin System
- Henry A. Acres, Director of Development, Cedar Crest College
- Rodney L. Boyes, Director, Learning Resources Center, General Motors Institute
- Jackie Pritzen, Associate Coordinator, Five Colleges, Inc.
- Dale W. Lick, President, Georgia Southern College
- Charles Merideth, Chancellor, Atlanta University Center
- Larry L. Rose, President, Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education
- Richard D. Wagner, Executive Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education
- Sister Ann Ida Gannon, Trustee, Mundelein College
- John Folger, former Associate Executive Director, Education Commission of the States, and now Professor, Vanderbilt University
- Lewis D. Patterson, Executive Director, Council for Interinstitutional Leadership
- Richard H. Konkel, former Executive Director, Southeast Florida Educational Consortium, and now Dean of Academic Affairs, Dakota State College

A roster of the 55 conference participants representing a diverse range of roles in the broader educational community is provided in the Appendix.

Quotations and Paraphrases

"An important question we've asked ourselves is 'How can we help ensure not only the survival of higher education, but the prospering of these institutions as well'. A strategy which appears most promising is the consortium movement—institutions sharing resources to improve the institutional quality and keep costs down. Simply, consortia must seek ways to more effectively use available resources."

E. Alden Dunham, *Carnegie Corporation of New York and Keynote Speaker for the Wingspread Conference*

"During the coming decade there will be temptation to engage in even sharper institutional competition for the shrinking student pool. I do not believe that 'Darwinism' is the answer to our problem; it results in the survival of the slickest, not necessarily the fittest. What is needed, in my judgment, is a degree of cooperation—of interinstitutional cooperation—far exceeding anything we have known in recent years. Rather than fight among ourselves, we should forthrightly identify what we can do best, reduce pointless duplications and redundancies, share resources, and work together."

Fred E. Crossland, *Ford Foundation*

"It matters little that legislators, taxpayers, and others may emphasize cooperation for primarily fiscal reasons. For those of us within the education community, the other, non-fiscal reasons may be equally or more important—and we appreciate that the anticipated savings do not always materialize, at least not at first. But the basic principles of cooperation, and of resource sharing, are and should be vital parts of a large and complex state university system such as ours."

Robert M. O'Neil, *The University of Wisconsin System*

"In planning for higher education needs, the agenda in the future is for an increasing state presence."

Robert Berdahl, *University of Maryland*

"The profession is in a perilous state. A long boom is ending with a crash. We are not agreed on the aims of education. We may be confusing diversity with anarchy. Thoughtful cooperation is one of our options. We must work to make it work."

Henry A. Acres, *Cedar Crest College*

"The basic question is whether the course of the future in American post-secondary education will be set by its leadership by choosing to follow a course of action built on cooperation or one built on *competition.* It is an uncertain but seemingly inevitable decision, but who will decide?"

S.V. Martorana, *Pennsylvania State University*

"I am convinced that the most effective political strategy for higher education during a period of declining enrollments is to join forces in a coordinated effort to achieve support for the entire enterprise, not support for special interests within higher education. In effect, I am suggesting that all of us in higher education circle the wagons and shoot out, rather than shoot in, as has often been our practice."

Richard D. Wagner, *Illinois Board of Higher Education*

"It is vital to recognize that cooperation neither requests nor requires a sell out. Institutions can cooperate and maintain their freedom, their independent viability, and their integrity."

Donald A. Johnson, *Quad-Cities Graduate Study Center*

"Cooperation develops most readily when the program benefits are intuitively obvious."

Larry L. Rose, *Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education*

"Only with the addition to consortium boards of outside, objective, community, corporate, regional, and professional leadership will cooperation and coordination be fully utilized through interinstitutional arrangements."

Dean E. Tollefson, *Union of Independent Colleges of Art*

"The spark of leadership that sets off cooperative change in any group of private institutions must come from the inside."

Charles Meredith, *Atlanta University Center*

"There is, of course, no single model for developing cooperative programs, and no handy set of prescriptions that can be written to guarantee success."

Jackie Pritzen, *Five Colleges, Inc.*

"The major constraints to effective interinstitutional cooperation are neither institutional nor professional, but those due to our human shortcomings in relating to one another."

Dale W. Lick, *Georgia Southern College*

"Now let us conceive a new paradigm in which open communications, shared resources, specialization by function, and accountability through performance appraisal will be the characteristic virtues."

Richard W. Jonsen, *Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education*

Section I.
BENEFITS AND POTENTIAL OF RESOURCE SHARING

A. What Resources Can Institutions Share?

In considering the question, the first inclination is to think of specialized or expensive equipment and facilities. The potential for sharing, however, may include all the assets and liabilities that institutions have: land, buildings, equipment, computers, libraries, programs, services, staff, faculty, and students. Beyond the collegiate institutions there also are the resources of industry and the community-at-large to which access can be gained through new linkage systems.

A review of the program index of the *1981 Consortium Directory*[2] reveals that cooperative endeavors now encompass almost every arena of individual institutional activity: administrative programs, academic programs, student services, educational research, and community services.

Through both voluntary cooperation and statutory coordination, there is a general trend for institutions to change from a tradition of autonomy to one of increasing interdependence. Though the need and logic for resource sharing are widely acknowledged, the movement to that end is often slow, difficult, and painful. The rate at which the change occurs and the type of mechanism (voluntary or statutory) by which sharing takes place will depend largely on the resourcefulness of the leadership—from the community and institutional level to the state level. When the voluntary initiative is too weak or proves inadequate, state legislation often becomes the last resort.

B. Why Share Resources?

Goals that can be achieved through the pooling of resources include:

1. *New Educational Opportunities.* By opening the doors among institutions to each other; students, faculty, and the community will have access to a greater variety of educational resources and experiences. For example, a student does not need to be limited to one locale or to programs of a single institution. Too, a group of institutions can justify a program collectively (such as an urban center) that they may not be able to offer individually.
2. *Improved Quality of Programs.* Resource sharing allows institutions and their students to better utilize their strengths and, when needed, to correct weaknesses. A combination of strengths is particularly helpful in specialized areas such as sponsorship of international education programs.
3. *Planned Diversity.* In today's world of advanced technology and specialization, it is no longer possible for a single institution to be all things to all people. Through collaboration institutions may build expertise in selected areas (based on a joint plan) without being forced to spread their resources too thinly.
4. *Cost Avoidance and Effectiveness.* A coordinated plan of facilities and programs obviously allows for minimizing program competition and duplication, and for better utilizing the limited resources that are made available for education.

5. *Coordinated Public Relations.* A jointly planned information program promotes a better understanding of educational offerings and needs and can result in better public support of education.
6. *Access to Other Regional Resources and Support.* There is a rich reservoir of educational resources in industry and the community-at-large if institutions will cultivate ways in which to tap those resources. The worlds of education and work both will benefit from a closer relationship.
7. *Greater Institutional Stability.* Institutions will find greater security by sharing information, planning, and resources than in going it alone. Long range risks are lessened by collaboration.

C. Examples of Documented Benefits

Giving substance to the broad goals noted above are numerous operational models of cooperation and coordination where very specific and tangible benefits are being realized. Briefly noted below are nine exemplary cases of joint endeavors of varying types that were represented at the Wingspread Conference.

1. *Cooperative Course Offerings.* The Quad-Cities Graduate Study Center, which draws on the instructional resources of eight public and private institutions in Illinois and Iowa, has over 4500 graduate course registrations per year. Aside from avoiding capital construction costs by contracting for facilities from a church-related college, the metropolitan education Center saves over $1,330,000 in instruction costs and $1,423,000 in student and faculty travel costs annually.
2. *Student and Faculty Exchange.* Five Colleges, Inc. comprised of four private colleges and one public university in Amherst, Massachusetts has over 6,000 cross-campus student registrations each year. A cost-analysis study in 1978 calculated a derived instructional benefit of $1,889,000 for one year. A regular bus schedule and other cooperative ventures such as joint departments and Ph.D. degree programs facilitate a high level of student and faculty exchange.
3. *Joint Staff and Faculty Development.* The 16 member institutions of the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education sponsor a variety of inservice programs on a continuing basis to reap the benefits of peer group learning. The voluntary consortium sponsorship offers a middle ground environment between the parochialism of an individual institution and the anonymity of state and national professional conferences. The consortium setting also allows for program continuity and individual follow-through on a reasonable cost basis.
4. *Shared Facilities.* Included among 22 major consortium programs of the Atlanta University Center are joint degrees, one computation center, one job placement center, one bookstore, and one security force. A more recent Center undertaking is a new $18 million library that will combine all the libraries of the six church-related, historically Black institutions.

5. *One Campus.* The Auraria Center for Higher Education in Denver, mandated by state legislation in 1974, has one site for three public institutions: one community college, one senior college,and one university. The shared facilities benefit students and taxpayers.
6. *Regional Telecommunications.* The Association for Higher Education of North Texas operates its own closed-circuit, interactive TAGER television network. The system delivers academic programs, many of which are advanced and technical, to the many campuses of the 15 institutions, to business and industry sites, and into homes.
7. *Statewide Group Purchasing.* The Massachusetts Higher Education Consortium of 42 public and private institutions has negotiated 73 contracts with 113 vendors for 1981-82, the fifth year for the Consortium. Purchases of more than $6,000,000 in the past year have resulted in documented savings exceeding $3,000,000 for the member institutions.
8. *Inter-State Analyses and Planning.* The Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education collects, analyzes and disseminates information for colleges and universities, statewide commissions, and legislators in 13 states. These services aid the development of consortia, enhance interstate reciprocity, and discourage unnecessary program duplication.
9. *Nationwide Student Recruitment and Admissions.* The admissions directors of the eight members of the Union of Independent Colleges of Art literally blanket the country in their team recruitment efforts. They likewise have joint public relations materials and have developed a Mutual Application Plan that allows simultaneous consideration of a perspective student at any of the member institutions.

Thirty-seven case studies of cost-effective cooperation are documented in *Benefits of Collegiate Cooperation*,[3] a publication of CIL available at no charge. The two-year study, supported by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, examines resource sharing in six program areas: cross registration, library and media cooperation, cooperative student services, group purchasing, cooperative non-traditional programs, and cooperative academic programs.

D. Factors That Discourage and Encourage Cooperation and Sharing

One of the insights provided by S.V. Martorana,[4] an established authority on regionalization and coordination, is that attitudes—perhaps more decisively than other conditions—play important roles in the organizational behavior of institutions. Six factors noted by Martorana that inhibit cooperative action are:

1. *Tradition and Momentum of Accepted Practice.* Cooperation is not the expected and generally accepted thing to do. Educational leaders are not socialized to plan jointly and to share. Rather, the emphasis is on competition. The individual who steps out of character is viewed with suspicion from both within and without.

2. *Lack of Locus for Initiative.* Cooperative settings lack a natural place for regionalism to be initiated and sustained. The atmosphere stultifies collective action. Interstate compacts and in-state initiatives, however, can help break the "log jams."
3. *Artificial Jurisdictional Boundaries.* State lines and other political boundaries cut through approximately 100 natural postsecondary regions in the country. At the present time, two regional pilot models are concentrating on process rather than structure to initiate interorganizational action.
4. *Problem of Information Acquisition and Exchange.* The problem is two-fold: acquiring good regional information and making the information available. The reluctance of institutions to provide and share data results in fragmented information and inadequate communication.
5. *Lack of Resources.* Funding for regionalism generally has come from institutional budgets, the federal government, or foundations, none of which assures continuing operations.
6. *Organizational Senses of Identity Proximity.* Institutions associate and disassociate themselves with other regional institutions in various ways: public-private, level of offerings, etc. It is more difficult to affect cooperation among similar institutions that share geographical proximity than among dissimilar institutions. Institutional diversification needs to be encouraged.

To balance the disscussion, Martorana presented six factors that encourage interinstitutional planning and action:

1. *Increased Public Endorsement.* Most states have given serious attention to the concept of regionalism for data gathering, planning, and related purposes. Public officials and the public expect better cooperation.
2. *Interest in Decentralization of Control.* The literature indicates that the trend for the past two or three decades was toward greater state and federal control of postsecondary education. There now is some evidence that support is growing for decentralization, for a return to a "sense of community."
3. *Institutional Struggle and Concern for Survival.* In a period of reducation, retrenchment, and reallocation, few institutions can expect realistically to succeed in an open-market, free-competition situation. Cooperation and mutual support will provide a greater sense of survival and security.
4. *Regional Dependence.* Most institutions are finding their existence depends on clienteles located within their regions. This can lead to more intense competition or cooperation depending on the institutional and state leadership.
5. *Spread of Regionalism in General Governmental Planning.* Planning offices exist in the executive branch of government in most states for matters such as health care, environmental protection, and so on. The trend to regionalism as a basic approach to planning for other functions of government will also encourage interinstitutional planning.

6. *Reliance on Common Funding Sources.* The increasing reliance of all types of institutions on the same sources of funding will lead to increasing pressure for institutions to cooperate rather than to compete and duplicate.

Martorana concluded with two basic questions: (1) Will institutions cooperate or compete? (2) Will the decisions be made within the educational enterprise or from without? There is good reason to believe that interinstitutional interaction, in some form, is to be the order of the day.

Section II.
STRUCTURES AND POLICIES TO ACHIEVE RESOURCE SHARING

A. The Impending Challenge

Felt and forecast urgencies in higher education may be described variously, but policy makers and executive officers share a common agenda: hold down current operation costs and divert meager new funds (if any) to emerging needs; improve program and service effectiveness and efficiency; develop new student markets . . . and so on. Given the apparently inverse relationships between dwindling population and enrollments, shifting program and service emphases to meet different arrays of student needs, and increasingly lean budgets—the challenge of leadership becomes one of mobilizing human energy and creative adaptations.

Students and faculty, business and industry, the general public and special interests all want quality assurance and cost effectiveness. Governors, legislators, state higher education executive officers, board members, and presidents can provide forthright and bold leadership by creating and implementing new policies which expect and reward interinstitutional collaboration. The time is right for addressing the issues behind the blunt question coming from so many consumer and societal sectors. "Why can't you people cooperate for the common good?"

B. What Are The Alternative Structures for Resource Sharing?

When policy makers determine "going it alone" is no longer feasible, they should be aware that an almost infinite range of functioning cooperative/coordinative structures are already in place to enable public and private institutions and related agencies to undertake resource sharing. A number of different types of organizational structures are noted below for illustrative purposes.

1. *Ad Hoc and Special Purpose Cooperative Arrangements.* These number in the thousands. Some of the more frequent program areas for resource sharing are library exchanges, joint use of computers, and joint sponsorship of international education programs.
2. *Long Range General Purpose Consortia.* This form of voluntary cooperation utilizes a common structure to provide numerous programs and services for member institutions. The number of such consortia has increased from 29 in 1967 involving less than 300 institutions to 135 in 1981 involving close to 1600 institutions.
3. *Community and Regional Groupings of Institutions.* Geographic proximity is often the basis for joint planning and action. The groups may be voluntary or statutory, single purpose or multi-purpose, and they may be initiated at the community, regional, or state level.
4. *Statewide Associations and Systems.* Each state has its own array of statewide agencies for fund raising, lobbying, planning, advising, and providing coordination and governance for member institutions. There is a trend to an increasing state presence for public institutions.

5. *Interstate Compacts and Contracts.* The three regional interstate compacts are: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education; Southern Regional Education Board; and New England Board for Higher Education. Reciprocal contracts often are authorized by state governments both within the compacts and among other states to enable professional and graduate-level resource sharing. The Education Commission of the States, which is a national compact, is the best source for information on statutory systems at the regional, state, and interstate levels.
6. *National Networks and Linkages.* These may be formal or informal and often involve individuals who as professionals "represent" their offices, institutions, or organizations in varying capacities.
7. *International Agreements.* With increasing frequency institutions in other countries are establishing interinstitutional systems and with increasing frequency American institutions and corporations are establishing formal relationships with entities in other countries. Interinstitutional cooperation is emerging as an international phenomenon.
8. *Combinations of the Above.* In selecting interorganizational structures, institutions usually participate in various types. A recent survey of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges found the average community college was involved in close to 100 cooperative arrangements.

One major shortcoming of these kinds of collaborative organizations is that they generally are in a relatively early stage of development, i.e., only a modest level of resource sharing has been achieved thus far. A second shortcoming is that they have only minimal involvement, if any, of non-collegiate entities such as corporations and proprietary schools.

When considering which kind of collaborative organization is needed in a particular situation, it is helpful to address several basic questions: (1) What are the needs? (2) What is the geographical area to be encompassed? (3) Who are the key institutions, organizaitons, and individuals to be involved? (4) What resources do they have to share? (5) What strategy can be devised to enlist and sustain their commitment to meet the needs through sharing?

The above suggestion is a simple rendition of some rather complex issues that need consideration but "solutions" are, in fact, available if people of good will are willing to accept the challenge. Using outside resource people and examining other organizational models are recommended; but, in the final analysis, the emerging organization must be shaped according to the needs and resources peculiar to the region being addressed.

C. What Kinds of Policies Are Needed to Further Encourage Resource Sharing?

Three general ways to encourage resource sharing are: (1) to recognize and support the cooperative leadership of institutional staff; (2) to provide financial incentives; and (3) to apply political and public persuasion.

Policies may be established at various levels by different entities to encourage the interreliance of institutions. Some examples are:

1. Institutional policies regarding tenure and promotion may need modification to encourage faculty exchange, joint appointments, off-campus instruction, and other non-traditional programs.
2. Institutions considering major changes such as new buildings, equipment, or programs should openly consult with other regional institutions and with community and state leaders before embarking on unilateral plans.
3. Educational needs assessments should be jointly planned and administered to address community-wide and region-wide educational concerns.
4. Business and civic leaders should be willing to use their positions to call for public forums when educational issues and needs are not being appropriately addressed. The involvement of institutional trustees and the media will broaden the scope of the discussions. Several consortia now have boards of directors where a majority of the members come from the community-at-large.
5. The policies of foundations can strongly influence the policies of institutions for resource sharing. A "suggestion" from the Kansas City Association of Trusts and Foundations that several individual institutional requests be combined into one joint proposal led to the formation of the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Educaiton in 1962. In Pittsburgh two foundations recently established formal pclicies that give priority consideration to consortium requests. Similarly, several national foundations such as the Carnegie Corporation of New York are encouraging resource sharing with a number of grants.
6. Local, state, and federal government agencies—caught in the squeeze to optimally distribute their limited funds—increasingly are receptive to new delivery systems which can generate greater returns for dollars invested.
7. Policy makers for foundations, government funding agencies, and corporations should weigh two key factors in considering multi-institutional awards: willingness of members to invest their own resources in the cooperative enterprise; and likelihood that the proposed resource sharing will become permanently on-going.
8. State policy makers—elected officials, commissions, boards, trustees—are perhaps in a more strategic position than anyone else to encourage and/or require interinstitutional cooperation and coordination.
   a. *State Funding Incentives.* Illinois under the Higher Education Cooperative Act appropriates several hundred thousands of dollars annually for joint programs. With modest funding, the state has become a national leader in evolving successful consortia that often include both public and private institutions. In addition to yielding important educational and social benefits, the cooperatives are proving to be cost effective. California, Ohio, Massachusetts, and New York have considered but not enacted similar legislation in recent years.

b. *Reciprocal Support Between States.* Iowa, in the case of the Quad-Cities Graduate Study Center which has institutions and students from Illinois and Iowa, appropriates support for the Center to match that received from Illinois under the Higher Education Cooperative Act. A number of other states have established reciprocal arrangements for specific programs and circumstances.

c. *Regionalization.* New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia have attempted with varying degrees of success to develop regions within the states for educational purposes. The efforts have had some impact on the institutions but a major failing has been the absence of state funding to help underwrite the regionalization efforts.

d. *Legislative Mandate.* Ever present when voluntary efforts do not succeed is the potential long arm of the state to require coordination. Legislation may be targeted for a specific locale such as the Auraria Higher Education Center in Denver, for regional consortia such as in Wisconsin, or for the entire state such as the recently established "super board" in Massachusetts. The alternative to going it alone or to legislated coordination is effective voluntary cooperation.

Section III.
ACTION AGENDA TO ACHIEVE COOPERATION AND SHARING

A. Need for Leadership Commitment

The top leadership in higher education—state legislators and governors, coordinating agency heads, professional association officers, accrediting association directors, institutional trustees and presidents—are in pivotal positions to establish policies to allocate funds to encourage and reward interprovider collaboration. Firm, continuing leadership is essential to counter the competition for dwindling resources and fewer students. During the 1980's and beyond, the key to quality institutional programs and services is in the commitment of leadership to interinstitutional planning and resource sharing.

Policies are needed at all levels—federal, regional, state, community, institutional—to insure that the interinstitutional dimension becomes an integral part of collegiate communications, needs assessments, planning, funding, delivering programs and services, and review/evaluation procedures. Current policies, organizational structures, administrative procedures, and business practices—all embedded in the rhetoric of institutional integrity and healthy competition—often discourage collaboration. Even worse, funding formulas and administrative patterns often actually "punish" those who would otherwise eagerly cooperate with other providers in serving the same student populations. Token encouragement, which merely suggests that educational providers should consider each other when planning and mobilizing their scarce resources to serve changing student populations, will not change the increasingly archaic values and attitudes which are typical of many higher education administrators. Martorana observed at the Wingspread Conference that "persons in high-level positions of policy formulation and decision-making just simply have not been socialized to a pattern of behavior which emphasizes interinstitutional planning, shared effort in information acquisition and exchange, and collective cooperative efforts to serve clienteles in the region concerned."[4]

Tomorrow's educational leadership needs to look beyond traditional higher education patterns in evolving new partnerships and delivery systems. Corporate training and staff development programs are steadily growing in numbers "because they cannot resolve their need for content and consistency in other ways. Indeed, a Technical Education Consortium is being formed by Texas Instruments, Xerox, IBM, Bell System Center, Westinghouse, Mobil, and others, to meet their training needs, but they would ". . . prefer to 'buy' from educational institutions where possible."[5]

The second sleeping giant offering more convenient learning alternatives is the range of non-traditional instructional modes which are becoming more and more cost-effective. Courses-by-radio/newspaper/television, open college, external degree programs, distance learning, and the like, can perhaps better accommodate a wide range of learning styles and life circumstances than campus-bound instruction stubbornly regarded by some as the only academically legitimate path

to learning. The winds of change may crumble a higher education edifice built to meet yesteryear's needs.

B. Administrative Principles

It is important to be sensitive to the many dimensions of interorganizational management. Several observations important to legislation and policy formulation follow:

- Besides the crucial leadership roles of policy makers in state legislatures, state executive offices, state coordinating agencies, associations, and in collegiate and non-collegiate institutions or corporations; there is a host of educational professionals who have specific administrative and instructional and supportive responsibilities, who *can* and *do* make policy work either or not work as they are so disposed. Thus, there needs to be a variety of organizational and human incentives to encourage and reward collaboration. By the same token, disincentives should exist to discourage reluctance and recalcitrance.
- Not only is there a need to ensure vertical or top-down continuity when establishing and implementing policies, but there is an even more difficult challenge to secure horizontal involvement. That is, conscious and concerted effort is needed to establish and maintain communications with others usually considered "outside or external" to individual colleges and universities, i.e., other collegiate institutions, school systems, vocational education districts, special interest groups, business, industry, special populations like the elderly or handicapped or racial/ethnic minorities, corporate training programs, government offices and agencies, chambers of commerce, business and professional associations, and so on. Student views likewise should be considered more than peripheral to the institutional decision-making process.
- Structuring relations to ensure complete communication and appropriate involvement in higher education decision making includes still other considerations: Which organizational levels should be interrelated (i.e., interstate, state, regional, local)? What decision process is primarily intended (i.e., communication, assessment, planning, funding, delivery, review)? What kind or kinds of higher educational programs are to be addressed (i.e., credit or non-credit; associate or baccalaureate or graduate or combinations thereof; traditional/non-traditional content and/or delivery)? What type of service is to be addressed (i.e., library, audio-visual, financial aids, career planning, placement, veterans affairs, recruitment, registration, advisement, institutional research/planning, faculty/staff development, student activities, purchasing, plant maintenance, or employee benefits)?
- Interinstitutional coordination and cooperation, at present or even in the ideal environment of strong interinstitutional policies, regulations, and directives, will likely not achieve all the benefits intended unless specific responsibility for pursuing cooperative agendas is clearly fixed and supported.

That is, it would appear accurate to observe that most cooperation occurs betwen institutions / providers having a formal mechanism (consortium) for facilitating and monitoring their interinstitutional relations. Most observers of organizational behavior would agree that when "everyone shares a responsiblity, no one is responsible" or can be held accountable, thus, the need for a clearly assigned responsbility (mechanism) to achieve clearly defined objectives.

C. Guidelines for Statutes, Policies, Regulations, Directives

The statements enumerated below are intended to guide persons and offices in devising, establishing, and implementing legislative statutes, system and institutional policies, organizational regulations and directives—appropriate to their particular needs and constraints—which will actually include interintstitutional or interprovider working relations in the cycle of management functions. The overall task is to include all the providers of higher education in the cyclical processes of communication, needs assessment, planning, funding, delivery, and review.

1. *Communication.*
   - Leadership personnel—governance boards, presidents, vice presidents, directors, chairpersons—should regularly share their publications and other types of public communications with their professional colleagues and counterparts in other institutions and organizations, collegiate and non-collegiate.
   - Chief executive officers of state systems, professional associations, and collegiate and non-collegiate higher education providers, at the appropriate levels (i.e., interstate, state, regional, local), should hold planned, regular meetings to address mutual issues and concerns regarding coordination and cooperation of their objectives and activities.
   - Professional personnel having similar and / or shared responsibilities in postsecondary education should hold planned, regular meetings at the regional, state, interstate and association levels, as appropriate, to mutually address specific issues of coordinated and cooperative programs and services.
   - Higher education state systems, associations of indeper.dent colleges and universities, proprietary schools, major businesses and industries, and state and local governments should give sufficient advance notice to the others (in this enumeraton) of any major shifts or changes in their roles and scopes of operation, to allow for adequate exchange of information and opinions.
2. *Assessment.*
   - Comprehensive assessments of the higher educational needs reflected in changing demographic, economic, and social patterns should regularly be conducted at the appropriate levels. Such assessments should be centrally coordinated at the state and regional levels in such a manner that the data collected can be useful at the interstate, regional, state, and local levels.

- Assessments of higher education needs should include not only judgments about specific types and numbers of programs and services needed but also about the current and projected adequacy of personnel and facilities to provide those educational opportunities.
- Assessments should be truly interinstitutional in intent and conduct, and not a mere juxtaposition of institutional or state or public or independent or provider statements of their respective missions and objectives and plans.

3. *Planning.*
   - The long-range planning for higher education in the states should be the responsibility of statewide planning units or commissions established for that purpose.
   - Statewide higher education long-range planning should reflect the educational needs of population clusters or geographic regions and the combined capabilities of public and independent and proprietary and corporate providers to meet those needs.
   - Statewide planning units or commissions should have the statutory authority to study and recommend to governance bodies of systems and institutions: (a) the number and type and location of all levels of credit programs and student services to serve the needs of population clusters or regions in the state, (b) the interinstitutional or interprovider arrangements most suitable to meet those needs in comprehensive, complementary and cost-effective ways, and (c) the policies appropriate for encouraging, facilitating, and rewarding interprovider collaboration.
   - Long-range and short-range postsecondary planning in the states should include assessments of the total resources or capabilities of all the higher education providers in the state and/or its regions, so that the state can contractually utilize independent and proprietary and corporate mechanisms to provide for higher education needs in educationally-efficient and cost-effective ways.

4. *Funding.*

   Wagner, with the Illinois Board of Higher Education, noted that money can be an effective, positive incentive for interinstitutional cooperation. He cautioned, however, that institutional commitment may wane when generous external funding is withdrawn.[6] External funding may relieve initial reluctance to use institutional funds to plan or help to implement an unproven cooperative venture, but too much funding may also be a substitute for institutional commitment and thus be self-defeating.
   - State formulas for appropriating capital and operating funds for higher education should include provision for genuine interinstitutional or interprovider arrangements intended to maintain or strengthen the quality of programs and services within the condition of scarce resources.
   - Priority weighting should be given to genuinely interinstitutional programs and services in establishing and funding new programs and services.

- Governmental and philanthropic funding sources should provide incentive or challenge grants to encourage and facilitate the planning and initial implementation of cost-effective types of interinstitutional or interprovider cooperation.
- An attractive portion of the cost-savings resulting from genuine interinstitutional activities should be allocated to providers and/or to their consortia as rewards and incentives to maintain and broaden collaboration.

5. *Delivery.*
   - Programmatic and personnel and administrative policies, regulations, and directives should be established or issued which encourage and facilitate and reward interinstitutional delivery of programs and services.
   - Special attention should be given in policies, regulations, and directives to areas of proven cost-effective cooperation: cross-registration procedures to expand student course and program opportunities and to share teaching talents; faculty exchanges; access to library and audio-visual holdings and services; cooperative continuous student services; group purchasing of commodities, and services and employee/student benefits; cooperative continuous academic programs; institutional research and regional needs assessments; faculty and staff development; non-traditional and experimental curricula and instructional modes.

6. *Review and Evaluation.*
   - Criteria should be established by governing boards and applied by coordinating agencies to periodically measure the outcomes or benefits of interinstitutional or interprovider coordination and cooperation. Criteria should address both the effectiveness and the efficiency of cooperative arrangements. The outcome criteria and evaluation process should be expressed in terms understandable by the general public as well as legislators and academic and other professionals.
   - Standard outcome measures which allow for quantitative and qualitative measurement include such indicators as numbers of persons served/graduated, new enrollment, student satisfaction, costs per student, costs per square foot/unit, time and travel savings, numbers of volumes or items or equipment available, costs avoided, qualitative impacts on business and industry recruitment and development, and consumer accessibility/convenience.
   - Regular and periodic reviews and evaluations of the progress of collaboration in programs and services should be established and monitored by boards and offices having supervisory responsibility for the management cycle. The interinstitutional dimension should be explicitly included in evaluative and follow-up studies and the review process at all organizational levels.

D. Action Agendas

The Wingspread conferees did not draft guidelines or policies for achieving the benefits of interprovider collaboration. Instead they remained sensitive to the need for defining and implementing state legislation, policies at the system and institutional levels, and interorganizational ties suitable for the circumstances of particular systems and regions. Thus, the "action agenda" described herein is a set of internally consistent statements which can be reformulated into legislative statutes, and system and institutional policies and regulations and directives, and then followed as guidelines in implementing the great variety of potential cooperative activities.

Where does collaboration among those providing higher education programs and services really begin? Who is really responsible for initiating or broadening coordination and cooperation? Does change happen "from the top down" or "the bottom up?" The global answer to these questions is: leadership is a shared responsibility and a shared process. Lick accurately observed at the Wingspread Conference that professionals of all types and at all levels must first get to know each other, usually by cooperating in some activity that has sure and clear payoff for all the parties. Then, as the basis for trust builds, the creative synergism of collaboration engenders a snowballing effect: cooperative attitudes grow; more potential types of cooperation emerge; new energy is uncovered; and benefits to students and institutions or providers increase steadily.[7]

But, who begins the process or who takes the first step? The conferees feel that the process should begin at the top of higher education systems. That is, governors of the states, state legislators, higher education regents/trustees and their chancellors and staffs hold the imperatives and the incentives by virtue of their crucial roles and responsibilities. Again, those in positions of responsibility for establishing, monitoring, and supervising policies, regulations, and directives should move to expect, and then reward, much greater coordination and cooperation than will occur by itself. Martorana and others note that some degree of mandate is needed, in order to effect collaboration. That may be so, especially if the "mandate," in so many words, indicates a clear commitment at the top and further indicates that (types of) coordination and cooperation will in fact be given priority consideration and rewarded in some demonstrably acceptable manner. Voluntary cooperation, spawned at the grass roots, may be more ideal, but purely voluntary cooperation is most difficult to achieve when "the system" only rewards isolated and competitive behaviors. Konkel made the plea for replacing the survival ethic with the cooperative ethic.[8]

It is suggested that the leaders of state higher education systems arrange a series of initial statewide workshops for the respective areas of academic affairs, student services, and business/administrative affairs. The invited representatives of collegiate (public, independent, and proprietary) and non-collegiate (business, industry, government, community service agencies) entities would identify for a respective area the changes needed in broad policy, structural relationships, and funding formulas to ensure that interprovider coordination and cooperation become an integral dimension of the management of that area. The

Council for Interinstitutional Leadership is the prime source of information on documented types and benefits of cooperation. The CIL can suggest strategies and even consultants to assist state systems or clusters of institutions mobilize their energies toward genuine collaboration.

The rational alternative to the survival ethic (which results in depriving students and institutions of greater opportunities and quality) is the cooperative ethic which enables institutions to enhance their achievements and improve their quality through sharing ideas and talents with others. Just like their human counterparts, institutions have to give in order to receive!

Bibliography / Footnote References

1. "Policy Advice on Resource Sharing in Higher Education," CIL brochure, October 1981, available at no charge.
2. *1981 Consortium Directory,* Ninth Edition, by Lewis D. Patterson and Marilyn Emplaincourt, 152 pages, reports on 132 general purpose consortia. Published by CIL, $9 prepaid includes postage and shipping.
3. *Benefits of Collegiate Cooperation,* 1979, 34 pages, highlights the findings of 37 case studies of cost effective cooperation. Published by CIL, available at no charge.
4. "Regionalism Related to Planning and Coordination of Postsecondary Education at the Working Level," by S.V. Martorana, Wingspread Conference, March 1981.
5. "Corporation and Interinstitutional Corporations in Higher Education," by Rodney L. Boyes, Wingspread Conference, March 1981.
6. "Strategies for Interinstitutional Cooperation: The Experience in Illinois," by Richard D. Wagner, Wingspread Conference, March 1981.
7. "The Human Factor in Interinstitutional Cooperation," by Dale W. Lick, Wingspread Conference, March 1981.
8. "Cooperative Ethic Called Crucial for Colleges' Survival," *Chronicle of Higher Education,* April 6, 1981, page 7.

Appendix: Conference Participants

Henry A. Acres, *Cedar Crest College*
Robert Berdahl, *University of Maryland*
Rodney L. Boyes, *General Motors Institute*
Charlena H. Bray, *Alabama Center for Higher Education*
Robert M. Briber, *Hudson-Mohawk Association of Colleges and Universities*
Alexander R. Cameron, *Rochester Area Colleges, Inc.*
Donald T. Cannon, *Northern Plains Consortium for Education*
George P. Connick, *University of Southern Maine*
Michael J. Devine, *Greater Cincinnati Consortium of Colleges and Universities*
E. Alden Dunham, *Carnegie Corporation of New York*
Claudette Dwyer, *Council of West Suburban Colleges*
Jean C. Evans, *University of Wisconsin-Extension*
Abraham S. Fischler, *Nova University*
The Honorable Richard Flintrop, *State of Wisconsin*
John Folger, *Education Commission of the States*
Sister Ann Ida Gannon, *Mundelein College*
Russell Garth, *Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education*
Harold E. Geiogue, *California Legislature*
Galen Godbey, *Lehigh Valley Association of Independent Colleges*
Jinny Goldstein, *Public Broadcasting Service*
John Goode, *John Goode Associates*
Ronald W. Hallstrom, *Rockford Regional Academic Center*
Henry Halstead, *The Johnson Foundation*
William Hyde, *Education Commission of the States*
Frederick H. Jackson, *Committee on Institutional Cooperation*
Donald A. Johnson, *Quad-Cities Graduate Study Center*
Richard W. Jonsen, *Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education*
Wayne R. Kirschling, *Indiana Commission for Higher Education*
Richard H. Konkel, *Southeast Florida Educational Consortium*
William D. Lewis, *Graduate Studies Center at Millikin University*
Dale W. Lick, *Georgia Southern College*
Alvin P. Lierheimer, *State University of New York at Albany*
Ralph E. Lundgren, *Lilly Endowment, Inc.*
George E. Manners, *University Center in Georgia*
S. V. Martorana, *Pennsylvania State University*
Ellen McGoldrick, *The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States*
William McNamara, *New England Board of Higher Education*
Charles Merideth, *Atlanta University Center*
George P. Miller, *Nebraska Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education*
Robert M. O'Neil, *University of Wisconsin System*
Allan W. Ostar, *National Center for Higher Education*
Franklin Patterson, *University of Massachusetts-Boston*

Lewis D. Patterson, *Council for Interinstitutional Leadership*

Gilbert A. Peters, *The Association for Higher Education of North Texas*

W. Werner Prange, *University of Wisconsin*

Jackie Pritzen, *Five Colleges, Inc.*

Jeanette F. Reibman, *Senate of Pennsylvania*

Lee Rockwell, *NETCHE Consortium*

Debra M. Amidon Rogers, *North East Consortium of Colleges and Universities in Massachusetts*

Larry L. Rose, *Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education*

Harry M. Snyder, *Kentucky Council on Higher Education*

Dean E. Tollefson, *Union of Independent Colleges of Art*

Julie Carroll Virgo, *Association of College and Research Libraries*

Richard D. Wagner, *Illinois Board of Higher Education*

Jerome F. Wartgow, *Auraria Higher Education Center*

Beverly T. Watkins, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*

About CIL

Beginning informally in 1967, the Council for Interinstitutional Leadership was founded as a national association in its own right in 1975. Incorporation in the District of Columbia as a non-profit organization and tax-exemption by the Internal Revenue Service followed in 1976.

CIL is unique among educational associations in its dedication to improving the effectiveness of postsecondary institutions through voluntary cooperation.

A primary function of CIL is to facilitate personal and professional contacts among consortium and related personnel. Services provided by CIL include:

- National conferences and regional workshops on current issues in higher education and interinstitutional cooperation
- An information and communications center which maintains a resource library on educational cooperation and coordination
- Publications on interinstitutional organizations
  Acquainter Newsletter
  Consortium Directory
  Special Reports
- Task group activities in State and Federal Relations, International Education, Theoretical Bases of Cooperation, and Corporate Relations
- Research consultation
- Referrals to individuals with specialized expertise

CIL has an open membership policy. Any consortium, association, institution, or individual may join and participate in all that CIL offers. Membership fees are:

Consortia—basic fee $225 plus $10 additional per institution, up to a maximum of $400.

Associations & Agencies—$100 (not intended for consortia).

Individuals—$35 (not intended for association or consortium directors).